G. R. S. 58]

Previous r

1894
~~191~~
(Land Rec :)

File No. 195 of 94

Serial Nos. 160.

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1610

Part B for February 1912

SUBJECT.

Refund of the produce amount of remarks to landlessness may ya of Balasur village.

Considered -

Indexed
Narasimha Rao

W D 1351—GPE—20,000—15-12-15

R. of 24-7-95

1

Office-Note

Pet^n No 2300 of 1894-95

Petitioner - Venkatasamy
Balaperr
Devarkallu Taluk

L.R.
195 of 1894
No 6

Subject - Grant to the petitioner
of Rs 35-1-0 alleged to
have been unjustly
recovered from pet^r
on account of the assessment
of Inam No 41 of Kallan

The facts of the case, so far
as the above pet^n is concerned
are as follows :-
I. No 41 was confirmed to
pet^r with the right to the
trees therein during the Survey
Settlement of 1886.
While correspondence between
the Sundry Supt & the D^t Commr
was pending regarding the
advisability of cancelling the
above settlement as I. No 41
was a bag type & occupancy
right was never enjoyed by pet^r
before 1886, the annual ass

3

In 1893 (Serial No 39) Govt after a very full discussion of the points involved (Please see Precis at top of file) sanctioned the proposals of the Survey Supdt

Under the above order, the value of the trees on S. No 41 levied from pet^r at the time of survey settlement in 1886 (Rs 24 Rs) was refunded to him and the right to the trees was resumed by Govt

Govt had also passed the decree amount Rs 147 (value of annual produce of S nos 41, 42 + 46 for one year)

Under these circumstances Govt levied the 87 cess value of annual produce on S. No 41 for the years 1888-87 + 1887-88 from pet^r While pet^r contends that at the time of the resumption of the rights to the trees vested in Govt only from 1888-89.

Pet^r's pet^n is dated 9/3/96

& the delay is explained by the fact that the pet[n] forwarded to the D.A.O for refn was detained there from 20/3/95 & 8/1/97 (one year & nine months) Whether pet[r] has received himself to the levy (Perhaps been only one reminder pet[n] & 6/8/95 since then) is not clear.

Recd 6th Jan 9/2/97

Sd) & 2nd Comdg Officer

MM 9/2/97.

As I understand the claim refers to a period between the death of the civil Decree, & the subsequent final revision of the settlement by Govt. & until the pet is entitled with refund. For this interval the reasons which governed the action of the civil court were & which the Govt had agreed to be valid were in full operation & the attachment [illegible] the real consp[irator] could not be diffe[rentiated] Ascertain this & if my view is correct anth[ority] the refund. I [illegible] to [illegible] is [illegible] the petitioner [illegible] full survey of [illegible] & not the magaïe Hoolganal Kanda only - The clai[m] also refers to 4 & 46 the millet of which remo[ved] as at the time the civil decree the pet is entitled with refund. Ord[er] grounds. the rents entitled the refund.

Sd

27.3.97

Sd 29/3/97

Sold the annual produce
of S. No 41 & 2 other S. Nos 42+46
to a third party.
On this he filed a suit
in the Bangalore Munsiff's
Court against the aml Sar
and* obtained a decree for
Rs 147 against the aml Sar.
which was paid by Govt
(Serial No 7 in the file)

* This was before the passing of the Land Rev Code

Govt thereupon (Serial No 19 in the file) requested the Survey
Supdt to revise the Settle-
ment of S. No 41 + 42+46 as the
municipal land above upon the
fact that while the occupancy
of tenure of S. No 1 was cancelled
by the Survey Supdt, that of
other Nos was not cancelled
- hence the Settlement of 1886
was still in force.

In the same year, viz 1888 the Survey
Supdt reported his revised
Settlement of S. No 41 and
advised the maintenance
of the Settlement of 1886 as
regards the other S. Nos
(Serial No 23).

5

Resubmitted to the 2nd Councillor

The points that require further elucidation are:

(1) What is the subject-matter of the petition

(2) Whether full survey assessment or the old hulgawal assessment was paid on S no 41 from the year of settlement

(3) Whether on the facts, pet is entitled to any relief.

(1) The subject-matter of the pet refers to the value of the average produce on S no 41 for the years 1886-87 & 1887-88 and does not refer to S nos 42-46. This point is not perhaps brought out clearly in the abstract, but from the endorsement of the annulsan (enclosure to pet No 2300 dt 8/3/95) this is clear. Moreover, as regards S nos 42-46, the settlement of 1886 was left undisturbed in 1893 when the settlement of S no 41 was revised

7

and that the amrayz sale amount of
Hearn S no 41 for the year
1889-90 was Rs 52

From the Munsiff's judgment
(enclosure to serial no 7 in the
file) it appears that the
amrayz sale amount of
S nos 41, 42 + 46 for 1886-87
was 147 Rs (the bill actually
sent to govt was for 192 Rs.
[vide serial no 37] including arts)
The Dy Commr has probably applied
the value of the amrayz paid
on S no 41 to the ratio of the
No of trees on S. no 41 to the
total no of trees in the three
S nos 41, 42 + 46. Page 6
of the Office-note gives the no
of trees in each survey no but
in the absence of information
as to the sale amount for
the year 1887-88, the calculation
cannot be worked out.

(2) From the enclosure to
serial no 40, it appears that
only the kulgaral assessment of 13 Rs was collected

from the year of settlement + not
the full survey assessment.

(3) From the remarks of the
Dewan (taken on 5th March 1897)
it appears that
Govt cancelled the settlement
of 1886 regarding no 41 as
essentially illegal, unauthorized
& beyond the powers of the Settlement
Offr. This aspect of the question
was not disputed in the Munsiff's
Court & the decree of the Munsiff
was held to be no adjudication on
the merits of the case.

If the pet^r is held entitled to
the average province on S no 41
for the years 1886-87 & 1887-88,
it seems to be just that he shd
pay the full survey assessment
for these 2 years (or the difference
of survey & fulgaval assessment,
as the pet^r has paid the latter
assessment)

The reason why full survey
assessment was not levied seems the
that the annulled settlement
the settlement & treated S no 41 as Govt

Draft of an Official memo to
the Dy Commr is submitted for
approval

M 5/4/97

If the original a
and the amendment
for S no 41 were
date of the sett
the Govt were
in order
other pet^r is
cancelled
Govt - the
Govt could
if this is a
Govt
state what
is refunded
pet^r on
of S. 41
is
enquire
order

10/4/9

Draft docket
pet^r & enqu

M 18

in 1893 and the 5% Commr would have been entirely unjustified if he had included S.No 42 to 46.

As regards the amount of refund, it is not equally clear whether Rs 35-1-0 (as put down in the Office-notes) or Rs 53-1-0 is the correct sum.

From plt's No 2300, it is clear that 18 Rs was actually collected from plt's + that Rs 35-1-0 was demanded. From plt's No 644 it appears that plt's complains of the unjust levy of Rs 35-1-0. Whether this was in addition to the 1st levy of Rs 18 is not clear.

From the records, the exact value of the annual produce of S No 41 for the years 1886-87 & 1887-88 cannot be ascertained. But there are some approximate data to go by.

On page 11 of the Office-note (of 1891) there is a memo by the Serishtadar which appears from what appears that previous to the year 1889-90, the annual produce of S No 41 was sold with that of S No 1

9 4) The Dy Comr in reply reported (in his letter No 708 dated 20-11-97) that S. No 41 of Nallur (extent 8 acres 15 guntas and containing 11 tamarind trees) was held by the pet on kulgaval tenure; that at the Survey Settlement of 1886-87 the assessment was fixed at Rs 13/- at 1½ Rs per acre and the tamarind trees were valued at Rs 24/- and made over to pet on payment of the said amount; that on the representation that the said Settlement was a loss to Govt, order No 844 dated 26-6-1883 was issued by Govt to the Survey Supdt to revise the settlement; that at the revision the produce of the trees was reserved by S. Supdt to Govt as before the Survey Settlement and the malkis amount ordered to be refunded; that the above

from the petr by the local authorities on the ground that the grant was cancelled; that the petr prays for refund of this amount Rs 35-1-0 and also Rs 18-1-0 being the sale proceeds of the year 1887-88; that the exact amount realised from the sale of 1886-87 could not be ascertained; that as the petr claimed and recovered Rs 31- for each tree for 1886-87, the sale proceeds had been fixed at Rs 35-1-0 inclusive of local cess;

And further report was called for on 11-12-97 especially as to whether any special asst was sanctioned by Govt as per order of 1893 and if not why the asst now levied should not be regarded as the halgeval rate

19

6) The Dy Comr in reply states (vide letter dated 2-9-01) that no special assessment on the land in question was sanctioned by Govt; and that the full Survey assessment is being recovered thereon; and that the assessment now levied should not be regarded as the Kulgaval rate as Rs 1-8-0 per acre is too high to be so considered and that it is but fair to levy a reduced rate owing to the restrictions laid on the enjoyment of the land by paras 3 and 4 of the Govt Proc of 1893 referred to

11.9.01.

The Dy Comr is requested to state whether the value of the produce of the trees in Sy No 41 for the years 1886-87 & 1887-88 viz Rs 35-1-0 & Rs 18-1-0 has been recovered from the pet & what is the exact amount refundable to the pet & the pet states that only Rs 1 was received from & regarding Rs 35-1-0 may be demanded from

above action was approved by Govt in Pro: No 17468-70 dated R.R. 214-92 20.4.1893 with the direction that the land owner should continue to pay a special assessment to be approved by Govt but not the asst as originally fixed; that till now however, Rs137- the asst formerly levied is being levied from the pets; that the malki amount was refunded in 1888-89; that though the trees belonged to the pets for a period of 2 years (from 1886-87 date of grant to 1887-88 date of cancellation of the grant), the produce thereof was sold by Govt for the said period; that as per decree produced by the pets in his favour, the decree amount was ~~re~~ paid to pets by Govt; that this amount was however recovered from

13

The Dy Comr in his reply No 84 dated 24.1.1902, reports that during the Survey Settlement of 1886-87, a wallet of Rs 2-4/- was recovered from him and the right to the trees on the said S.No 41 was regulated as belonging to him; but that at the usual sale of timber produce, the produce of the trees in question were included and sold and in two years (Rs 30.1.0 in 1886-87 Rs 18.1.0 in 1887-88) Rs 53.2.0 was realised and credited to Treasury; that in 1888-89 the right to the trees on S.No 41 having been held not to vest in the petr the value recovered from the petr was refunded to him and the land treated as belonging to Govt.

a1 that

15 granted the [illegible]
occupancy rights in
Survey No 41; but this
settlement was revised
in 1888-89 when
Col Grant, on the
motion of Govt. ~~revised~~
modified the pet[r]s
tenure to one of hereditary
tenure without any
right to the trees and
the sum of Rs 24, which
had been paid by the pet[r]s
in 1886 as the price of
the trees, was also
refunded to him
The pet[r]s now contends
that, as the trees vested
in him from 1886 to 1889
when the settlement was
revised, he is entitled
to the unexpired value

on the pet[r]s paying
Rs 24 being the estimated
value of the trees

of the produce which
had been sold by the
amin for Rs 53-2-0
for the two years
from one point of view
Lala Godakumar, the
petnr is entitled to only
the interest on Rs 24 (price
of the trees) for the two
years, but as the then
Dewr (now Dewan) in his
order dated 27/3/97 was of opinion
that the value of the produce should
be refunded, the
same may now be made

30/1/02

It may be made

17/2

17/2/02

Obl: Ord & Govt
Contempt. Case 19-2-02

that the last year's sale
proceeds (viz) Rs 53-2-0
have not been
repaid to the party, to
which he is entitled
having paid the value
of Rs 24/- for the trees;
and that the amount
will have therefore to
be refunded to him.

30-1-02

As the correspondence has
been going on for nearly 5
years, and as there are
materials sufficient for
a decision, a recapitulation
of the facts of the case seems
necessary.

The petr claims refund
of the value of the produce
of the trees on S No 41 for
the years 1886-87 & 1887-88,
the amounting to Rs 53-2-0.
At the settlement of Devanahalli
taluk in 1886, the petr was

Revenue Branch

Please put up the file
when received from
Revenue Branch.

[illegible] 20/1/97

The file No 214 A/96
put up.

[illegible] 21/1

sent [illegible]

[illegible] 20/1/97

8/2/97.

LR
195 of 94

1

There is a pet[n] of 1895
Coming to me for disposal
after 2 years

M 8/2/97

1) Stamp sufficient
2) In time
3) Appeal against D[C] Comm[r]'s
order D 4/1/96 - directing the
levy from pet[r] the balance of the
arrears pertaining to S. No 41
for the years 1886-87 + 1887-88.
Shd D to 2nd Comm[r] A - [illegible]
a short note

MZ
9/2/97

Docket No 4377/85 from the Asst and other papers connected with Ballari Amani case was finish with Godbole 5885 (para 5 of Revenue No 6539 dt 5/11/85 and Endt to Chief Secretary 8/11/85 and from the Register of cases submitted to the Subordinate, it is marked as having been submitted to Revenue Subordinate 12 Nov 85. Now is wrongly marked both in the Govt and Revenue Register to show that it was disposed of or which had become of the papers

18/3/95

18/3/95

Taluk. Ramdurg

District. Belgaum

Date of Arzi. 8-3-95

Date of Receipt. 11-3-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 1

ABSTRACT.

Sales first Survey Nos. 4, 23-4 of Hallur (Ramdurg Taluk, Belgaum District) and Survey Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40,

MYSORE DEWAN'S COURT
REGD. IN 2300/11
DATE

ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣವನ್ನು ಕೈಬಿಡಲಾಗಿದೆ.

2.30.ಪಿ.ಎಂ ಕ್ಕೆ ಪುನಃ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವಾಗಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರ ವಿಚಾರಣೆ ಮುಂದುವರೆಯಿತು.

ಸದರಿ ಪ್ರಕರಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಾದ ಶ್ರೀ ಕೆ.ಎಸ್.ಮಂಜುನಾಥ್ ಬಿನ್ ಲೇಟ್ ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿದ್ದಲಿಂಗಪ್ಪ ಇವರು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಮುಂದುವರೆಸಿದ್ದು ಅವರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂ-2 ಎಂದು ಗುರುತಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

ಪಿ.ಡಬ್ಲ್ಯೂ-2 ರವರ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯನ್ನು ಪಿ.ಎಸ್.ಐ ರವರು ಕನ್ನಡ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಟೈಪ್ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದು ಅದನ್ನು ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರಿಗೆ ಓದಿ ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಸದರಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಕ್ಷಿದಾರರು ಸಹಿ ಮಾ

ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ: ಸಂಸದೀಯ ವ್ಯವಹಾರಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಶಾಸನ ರಚನೆ ಇಲಾಖೆ

(2)

Gen. Serial No. 32.]

189 5

No. 644

Name of Petitioner.

Village.

Taluk.

District.

Date of Arzi. 6-8-95

Date of Receipt. 7-8-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. Nil

ABSTRACT.

9 1897 3

From The Secretary to Govt Revenue and Rev Depts

To The Deputy Commissioner Bangalore Dt

Dated 25 =

Despatched 21 April 97.

Received

General No. 9131

P. No. 1563

Enclosure No. 2

In forwarding the accompanying petn nos 2300 and 644 dated 8-3-95 and 6-8-95 respectively received at the Revenue office from Venkatarangia of Balepura in the Devanhalli Taluk, complaining of the unjustly from him of the sale amount of Mroji produce of S. nos 41 of Vallur for the years 1886-87 & 1887-88, has the honor to request that the

RK. 1954 9

The deputy Commissioner will be required to submit a full report on the following points

1. If only Half yearly assessment has been paid for S. No. 41 since the date of the Survey Settlement which would have been the result in selling the produce of the tree and the petr is not entitled to any refund. If so, what amount is refundable to the petr on account of S. No. 41 during the period under reference (namely the years 1886-87 and 1887-88)? If it is found that only half yearly assessment has been paid since the Survey settlement?

2. If not, what amount is refundable to the petr on account of S. No. 41 during the period under reference (namely the years 1886-87 and 1887-88)?

By order

Asst Secretary

17/4/97

Please see file No: 3523/88.

AK
2/12/97.

Refers past use.

Dup?
3/12/97 Rec'd Branch

Please put up Proc of 93 referred to in this.

MC
3/12/97.

Proc: Rejection (Please put up with file) AK 3/12/97

Dup?
3/12/97.

Rejection

Ref: Sec 22 of 92 Rejection - Returned to Revenue on 9-3 AK 98.

Submitted
BK
6/12/97

DM
6/12
Mon 6/12/97

The only point in which the Comr & the appellant differ is that the Collector has assessed the land as cultivated whereas the appellant contends that the land is waste or the land revenue assessment should be remitted. Seems to be doubtful. In memo No 8944 dated 2/6/93, the Govt have called for the land revenue assessment & the Comr now calls it. The Govt may decide finally & the Collector may be informed accordingly.

MC 11/12/97

Gen. 31]

1897

From The Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District.

To The Secretary to the Govt
of Mysore,
Agrl & Rev Departments.

Dated 25th November/97.

Despatched 27th Do

Received

General No.

No. 708

Enclosure No. 1 file

Govt Order No. 9701
P. 1563
dt 24: April 1897.

Petition from Baiapa & Siddappa claiming the sale proceeds of the Cumry pound of Kumsi &c of Kadur Mandal Melkar for 1896-97 & 1897-98.

Peter M
30.11.97

Rec'd
4/12

GL. No. 5944
Ref 294
- 1 DEC 97
REVENUE OFFICE

his paying ~~30~~ that sum. On a re-
-presentation made to the effect that
the grant of the land with the trees
&c was a loss to Government, the
Government in their letter Camp No.
844 dated the 26th June 1888 requested
the Superintendent of the Revenue
Survey to revise the settlement. At
the revision, the Survey Superintendent
directed that the produce of the
trees standing on the said survey No. 41
should, as before the Survey Settle-
-ment, be reserved to Government
and that the malki amount should
be refunded to the petitioner. Govern-
-ment in their Proceedings No 17468-70 / R.F 214-92 dated the 20th April 1893 approved of this
decision and directed that the holder
of this land should continue to pay
a special assessment to be approved
by Government and not the assessment
as fixed at the Survey Settlement.
Till now, however, Rs 13/- the assessment
fixed at the Survey Settlement on the
said Survey No. 41 has been recovered.
The malki amount was however re-
-funded in 1888-89, as admitted by the

Petitioner in his petition of the 7th March 1895. From the time of the grant of the trees to the cancellation of the grant is a period of 2 years viz 1886-87 and 1887-88. Although during those years the trees belonged to the petitioner, still the produce thereof was sold by Goverm.-ment. So the petitioner sued the Goverm.-ment for the sale proceeds of the year 1886-87 and got decree in his favor and obtained the decree money from Government. Subsequently however the local authorities levied the amount from the petitioner on the ground that the grant of the trees was cancelled.- He now complains of this and wants the sum (Rs-as-P. 35-1-") to be refunded to him and claims also the sale proceeds (viz: Rs-as-P. 18-1-") of the produce of the trees for 1887-88, as in that year also the trees belonged to him. The exact amount realized from the sale in 1886-87 cannot be ascertained, as the sale records are reported to have been submitted to Government by the Inspector General of Forests. But, however, the petitioner having claimed and recovered Rs 3/- for each tree for the year (1886-87) the sale amount has been fixed at

Bangalore District.
Dy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 25th November/97

D. No. 708
Su: 1/file

27/G

To,

The Secretary to the Government
of Mysore,
Genl & Rev: Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No 9131 dated the 24th April 1897, calling P. 1563 for report on the petitions of Balepur Venkatramia, claiming the sale proceeds of the Amaroji produce of Survey No 41 of Vallur in the Devanhalli Taluk for the years 1886-87 and 1887-88, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The said Survey No 41 of Vallur is a piece of land measuring 8 acres and 15 guntas and contains 11 tamarind trees. It was held by the petitioner on Inamdari tenure. At the Survey settlement made in 1886-87, the assessment of this land was fixed at Rs 13/ at 1½ Rupee per acre and the tamarind trees on it were valued at Rs 24/ and made over to the petitioner Venkatramia on

23 b draft

(7)

PR
195-94
5

To Ne Dy Comm[r]
Bangalore

No 5701/P.699 & 11.12.97 P.

His letter No 708 & 27/11/97 reporting on the petition of Devanahalli taluk and stating that the survey assessment of Rs 13 had been levied on 1 no 4 of Nattur since the introduction of survey settlement

Referring to the above he has the honour to invite his attention to memo No 894 & 2/6/93 to the Govt and Comm[r] forming the enclosure to the Dy Comm[r]'s docket No 103 & 27/7/93 to the Chief Secy

wherein there it is stated 37
that the annual <u>halfaval</u>
<u>rate</u> of 13 Rs has been
levied on S no 41 since the introduction
of settlement

2 It is further observed that
in para 3 of Govt Proc
No 17468-70 & 20/4/93
R F 214-92
it was intended to impose
a special assessment on
S no 41 on a report from
the DJ Coun^r the DJ Coun^r
is requested to state whether any
special assessment was
sanctioned by the Govt and
if not why the assessment
now levied should not be regarded
as the halfaval rate

By order

Fr Sec^y

Rs 35-1- a inclusive of local cess.

3. The vernacular records of the case are submitted herewith for reference as also the enclosures of the docket under reply.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your Most Obedient Servant

W. Hunter Lang

Dy. Commissioner.

mms

51

Ref to put up

All

6-9-01

Gen'l Records

Please put up

Q 2149 of 92 linked together with Q 2166 of 93

which are wanted for this letter

All

6-9-01

Q 2149 of 92 linked together and D F 15 of 93 put up

6/9/01

6/9/01

Submitted with office note contented.

11.9.01

1897 b

18

20

3087

4-9-1901 | 1901

From Assistant Collector & Magistrate in charge of Revenue Duties by Commissioner Bangalore District

To H. V. Nanjundayya Esqr. M.A. M.L. Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore Revenue Dept.

Dated 2nd September 1901

Despatched 3rd September 1901

Received

General No.

D No. 277

Enclosure No. V. Records.

Secretary's direction No. 5101 of the P 699

11th December 1897

Submits information with records on the petition of Balepur Venkataramiah of Devanahalli claiming the sale proceeds of the current produce of S No 41 of Kallur village.

Petn

4.9.01

To Petition Branch

(1). Secy's direction No. 5101 P 699 dated 11.12.97 with petition Branch

Petition No. 3123 9.5.99

Q 2149 of 92 linked file

Q 2166 of 93 & other records put up.

4/9/01

332

4/9/01

D. No 2771
Jud. V Secn

Bangalore District
Dy. Commissioner's Office
Bangalore 2nd September 1897

From,

M. S. Narayan Rao Esqr
Dy Commissioner
Bangalore District

To,

H. V. Narajundayyar Esqr M.A.L.L.
Secy to the Govt of Mysore
Rev and Cust Depts.

Sir,

With reference to your docket No 5101/699 dated the 14th December 1897, in re the application of Balepur Venkata-ramanayya for the refund of Rs 53-2-4 being the amount sale proceeds of Survey No 41 of the Kallur village in the Devanahalli Taluk for the years 1886-87 and 1887-1888, I have the honor to submit the records connected with the case

and

and a Memo No. 325 dated 24th September 1900, from the Assistant Commissioner of the Bangalore Range, from which it will be seen that no special assessment on the land in question was sanctioned by Government, as intended in Government Proceedings No. 17468-70 / R 7214-92 dated 20th April 1893, and that the full survey assessment is being recovered thereon.

2. In reply to the query as to why the assessment now levied should not be regarded as the Hulgaval rate, I am of opinion that the amount viz, Rs 1-6-0 per acre, is too high to be considered Hulgaval rate, and it is but fair that a reduced rate should be imposed thereon

owing

owing to the restrictions laid on its enjoyment by paras 3 and 4 of the Government Proceedings referred to above.

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

File No 2140/94-2

1901

From

THE SECRETARY TO THE
GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

Rev & Ind Depts

To

The Dy Commr
Bangalore Dt

125-94
1

Dated

Despatched 26/9/01
28th

Received 28

General No. Pet
No. 676

Enclosure No.

His letter No 2-7.S 2-9-01
reporting on the petn: of Bale-
-pen Venkatramiah of Deva-
halli, claiming the Sab proceeds
of the Amrut produce of S. No
41 of Nallur village, Deva-
dalli Taluk. —

~~Has~~
In forwarding the
records received with
the above for reference
and Resubmission
has

has the honor to request
that he will be so good
as to state whether
the value of the produce of
the trees in S. No 41 for the
years 1886–1887 and 1887–88
viz Rs 35-1-0 and Rs 18-1-0
has been recovered from
the petitioner and what is
the exact amount refundable
to him on the petn: of 8.3.95
the petn: states that only Rs 18-1-0
was recovered from and
requests that Rs 35/1/0 may
not be demanded from
him. An early reply is requested

By Order

DFC

Jon Secretary

DE
24/4

RD 312 97-2

Reputers

28-1-02

Submitted with office note continued.

30/1/02

30/1/02

RD 30/1/02
1498

Please see the 1st Councillor's order on the office note.

C&R
14/2/02

RD 74
MS

OFFICE OF THE
9752
27 JAN. - 02
272

FROM The Dy Commissioner Bangalore District

To The Secy to the Govt of Madras Revenue (Land) Deptt

Dated

Despatched 24th/25th January 1902

Received

General No.

No. 842

Enclosure No. 1: Paper.

Secy's docket No Pet 676 of the 28th September 1901.

States that the sum of Rs 53-2- being the 2 years' Sale proceeds is refundable to Balepur Venkatasamiah of the Devanahalli Taluk

Pet
29/1/02

trees standing on survey no. 41 of Nallur village was registered as belonging to him. But at the usual sale of amarai produce, the produce of the trees in question was included and sold and in two consecutive years, (Rs 35-1-0 in cy 1886-87 and Rs 18-1-0 in 1887-88) Rs 53-2-0 was realized and credited to Treasury. It having been decided in 1888-89 that the right to the trees on Survey No. 41 does not vest in the said Venkataramiah, the value recovered from him is reported to have been refunded to the party and the land thenceforward treated as belonging to Government. The two years' sale proceeds viz. Rs 53-2-0 have not been repaid to the party, to which he is entitled in consequence of cy having

44 98.

having paid the Malki of Rs 24/- for the trees. This amount will have therefore to be refunded to him.

2. The vernacular papers received with the docket under reply are herewith resubmitted

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obedient servant

Illegible

Dy. Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

D. 842

Ens V. Papers

Bangalore District,
Deputy Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, 16th January 1892.

From,

M. S. Narayan Rao Esq.,
Deputy Commissioner,
Bangalore District.

To,

M. D. Ranganadayya Esq.,
Secretary to the Govt. of Mysore,
Ceri: Head Depts.

Sir,

With reference to your docket no. Rev 676 of the 25th Septem-ber 1891, regarding the amount that has to be realized to Raipur Venkataramaiah & the Devanhalli Taluk, I have the honor to state that during the Survey Settlement in 1886-87, a Maiki of Rajpur was granted free of assessment to the

Trees

Two drafts

14

Progs of the Forest Dr Mysore.

Read:-

Petn No 2300 dt 8-3-95 from Venkataramaiah & Balyéna the Devanahalli Dt, claiming the refund of the value of the produce of the trees on S. No 41 of Nallur village, for the years 86-87 & 87-88 amounting to Rs 53-2-0.

2. Correspondence ending with letter No C. 842 dt 24-1-02 from the Dy. Conr, Bangalore Dt, submitting the records connected with the above and recommending the refund of the above amount.

C.R. 195-14

order thereon. Pet dt 21/2/02 for

The recommendation of the Dy. Conr is sanctioned.

C, 19/2/02.

Sd/-

for Secretary

19/2/02

To the Dy. Conr, Bangalore Dt with secret

537